

Comment on “Critical current density from magnetization hysteresis data using the critical-state model”

P. Chaddah

Low Temperature Physics Laboratory,

Centre for Advanced Technology,

Indore 452013, India

(February 6, 2008)

Abstract

A recent paper [Physical Review **B 64** 014508 (2001)] claims to present an exact method to extract the critical current density J_C from the M-H hysteresis curve. We show that this claim appears unjustified.

Keywords: Critical state model, critical current density, M-H hysteresis.
74.60Ge; 74.60Jg

The hysteresis in the isothermal M-H curves of superconductors was first related to the critical current density J_C by Bean's critical state model¹. Fietz and Webb² showed that the errors involved in extracting the field-dependent $J_C(B)$ from these M-H curves are of order (d^2J_C/dB^2) . The applicability of this method of extracting $J_C(B)$ has been studied in great detail^{3,4} after the discovery of high- T_C superconductors. The recent claim⁵ of an 'exact method' of obtaining the same information from the same data, consequently, needs to be examined.

The 'exact method' of reference[5] relates, in its equations (7) and (8), the derivatives of the forward and reverse envelope M-H curves to $J_C(B_a)$, and to the difference between the applied field B_a and the field B_{C+} (or B_{C-}) at the centre of the sample during the increasing (or decreasing) field cycle. It then presents a method (see figures 2 and 3 of reference[5]) to relate the central fields B_{C+} (or B_{C-}) to B_a via the measured M-H curves. All these results are obtained for a sample in the shape of an infinite slab parallel to the applied field.

Analytical solutions of Bean's critical state model, for various $J_C(B)$, are known for infinite cylinders (of various cross-sections) in parallel field geometry, when the sample demagnetization factor $N=0$.^{3,6,7} It is known that while field profiles $B(x)$ depend on $J_C(B)$ and not on the shape of the cylinder's cross-section, the value of the magnetization M is dictated by the cylinder's cross-section.^{6,7} While equations (5) and (6) of reference[5] are valid for all $N=0$ cylinders, the derivation leading to equations (7) and (8) breaks down. This is simply because the volume element at x depends on the shape of the cylinder's cross-section, resulting in different x -dependent weight-functions within the integral sign. Equations(11) of reference[3] give explicit analytic expressions for the M-H curves of circular cylinders when $J_C(B)$ follows the exponential model $J_C(B) = J_C(0)\exp(-B/H_0)$. It is also known⁶ for the exponential model that $B_{C+} = H_0 \log[\exp(B_a/H_0) - (H^*/H_0)]$ and that $B_{C-} = H_0 \log[\exp(B_a/H_0) + (H^*/H_0)]$. It is straightforward to confirm that equations (7) and (8) of reference[5] are not satisfied.

The argument leading to figure 3(b) of reference[5] is based on the relation (depicted in figure 2 thereof) that the total flux contained in the sample is the same in the field-increasing

case when the applied field is B_a , as in the field-decreasing case when the applied field is B_{C+} (corresponding to that B_a). It follows from the results in reference[3] that this is not true for circular cylinders for $J_C(B)$ following the exponential or the Kim-Anderson models. It follows from reference[1] that this is not true for a circular cylinder even when $J_C(B)$ is independent of B . It is straightforward to see that this result also breaks down for cylinders with other cross-sections⁶.

We assert that the method of reference[5] is applicable only for an infinite slab in parallel field, and is not valid for any other sample shape. The conventional method¹⁻⁴ for extracting $J_C(B)$ from isothermal M-H hysteresis curves is valid for various shapes, and involves errors whose upper bounds are known.

Finally, reference[5] claims to show that the shape of the hysteresis bubble identifying the peak-effect in $J_C(B)$ is asymmetric about the peak field B_P . This is shown using the input that $J_C(B)$ decays as the magnitude of $(B-B_P)$ rises. While this result has been shown earlier explicitly with reference to the peak effect (see figure 2b of reference[7]), the calculation is identical to the special case of $B_P=0$. This asymmetry in the ‘central peak position’ has been studied extensively in recent years⁸.

REFERENCES

- ¹ C.P. Bean, Phys. Rev. Lett. **8** 250 (1962); Rev. Mod. Phys **36** 31 (1964).
- ² W.A. Fietz and W.W. Webb, Phys. Rev. **178** 657 (1969).
- ³ P. Chaddah, K.V. Bhagwat and G. Ravikumar, Physica **C 159** 570 (1989).
- ⁴ D.X. Chen and R.B. Goldfarb, J. Appl. Phys. **66** 2489 (1989).
- ⁵ A.A. Tulapurkar, Phys. Rev. **B 64** 014508 (2001)
- ⁶ K.V. Bhagwat and P. Chaddah, Phys. Rev. **B 44** 6950 (1991); P. Chaddah, S.B. Roy, S. Kumar and K.V. Bhagwat, Phys. Rev. **B46** 11737 (1992); P. Chaddah in Studies of High Temperature Superconductors, edited by A.V. Narlikar (Nova Science, Commack, NY1995) vol.14, p245.
- ⁷ P. Chaddah, S.B. Roy and M. Chandran, Phys. Rev. **B59** 8440 (1999).
- ⁸ D.V. Shantsev, M.R. Koblishka, Y.M. Galperin, T.H. Johansen, L. Pust and M. Jirsa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** 2947 (1999).